

**QUESTIONS GENERATED FROM THE MOUND CLOSURE PRE-PROPOSAL
CONFERENCE/TOUR
WEEK 2 (August 19-23, 2002)**

114. Executive Summary - "Offerors are advised this solicitation contains DEAR 952.250-70, Nuclear Hazards Indemnity Agreement (JUN 1996), and Section H.18, Price Anderson Amendments Act Noncompliance. The Department of Energy's authority to enter into indemnification agreements under Price Anderson Amendments Act has expired. Legislation is currently pending to provide indemnification under the DOE's contracts." If the Price Anderson Amendments Act nuclear indemnity has not been reauthorized or extended by the time of contract signature, what nuclear hazards indemnity (e.g., FAR 52.250.1, Indemnification under Public Law 85-804) will DOE include in the contract?

ANSWER: An amendment to the RFP will detail how contractors will be covered.

115. RFP Section L.18.IV(1) - "If the offeror has no past performance, the offeror shall submit past performance information from each of the teaming partners or parent corporations." The RFP instructions seem to indicate that in the case of an LLC or joint venture, DOE would like 3 relevant past performance references for all teaming partners in the entity. Does DOE also want three past performance references for each of the major teaming partners in a prime-sub relationship?

ANSWER: Each major team partner provides three references.

116. L.18.IV.(3) - "A list of contracts terminated (partially or completely) within the past three years, including the contract number, dollar amount of contract, brief description of SOW, reason for termination, sponsoring agency, and name and telephone number of the CO." Do they want a list of only federal contracts terminated or any commercial or federal contract? "sponsoring agency" insinuates federal, but...should we ask?

ANSWER: Only federal contracts that have been terminated, partially or completely, within the past three years shall be provided.

117. L.18.IV(4) - "The offeror shall provide the Past Performance Questionnaire, Attachment 1, to each of the references named in Attachment 1. The offeror shall request that the references return the Past Performance Questionnaire directly to the address identified in L.20." The RFP specifies the address for return of the Questionnaire, but not the date and time. Does DOE want the questionnaires returned concurrent with the proposal (i.e., September 20, 2002)?

ANSWER: The DOE would like the past performance questionnaires returned by September 20, 2002. Offerors should inform their references of this date.

118. L.22 Questions On Solicitation - "Offerors and interested parties may submit questions regarding this solicitation prior to September 6, 2002 . . ." In the Request for Proposal (RFP) Summary presented at the Pre-Proposal Conference held August 12, 2002, DOE indicated that "Questions may be submitted until August 30." Is it DOE's intention to entertain questions until September 6, 2002?

ANSWER: Yes. The pre-proposal conference slide incorrectly showed the August 30, 2002, date. However, the RFP is correct (Section L.22) in stating September 6, 2002, as the date offerors and interested parties may submit questions.

119. L.23(d) Oral Interviews - "The offerors are not authorized to bring written materials to the oral interviews." Will DOE make available a white board or similar device to facilitate descriptive answers from interviewees?

ANSWER: No.

120. Reference RFP Section C—Both Exhibit 1, Building Number "SW", and Exhibit 2, Building Number "T" reference "Exhibit 2a" of the contract documents. There is no "Exhibit 2a" posted on the SEB website. Please provide the correct reference or Exhibit 2a.

ANSWER: The Exhibit 2a was posted on the web site on August 7, 2002 as "Status Detail on R/SW/T Buildings". It can be found in the "Technical References and Links" section under "Specifications". An amendment to the RFP will include Exhibit 2a.

121. RFP Section C, Exhibit 3 "Utilities Work Scope" states under the water distribution system that "two water towers are ... associated with Building 58 and P." Please clarify the location of the two elevated water towers on site.

ANSWER: As stated in Exhibit 3 there are three water towers. Two are elevated towers and one is a ground level tank. One elevated tower is referenced in Exhibit 1 in the P Building Description. The ground level tank for fire suppression is referenced in Exhibit 1 in the Building 58 Description. The other elevated water tower is referenced in Exhibit 3 as the SM/PP Tower located to the west of Building 38. All were shown during the site tours.

122. Based upon RFP Section C, Exhibit 4, Section III, Remaining Response Actions, the total estimated Low Level Waste (LLW) is 2,576,000 cubic feet and based upon Exhibit 4, Section I, Ongoing Response Actions (from the reference documents on the SEB website), the estimated LLW is 1,381,000 cubic feet. Thus, the ongoing and remaining estimated LLW volumes total 3,957,000 cubic feet of soils to be transported and disposed off-site. RFP Section C.2.1.1.5, Physical Demolition, further estimates an additional 300,000 cubic feet as the in-place LLW volume for the building footprints. The total LLW soils referenced by the RFP is, therefore, 4,257,000 cubic feet. A review of the "Performance Baseline Basis of Estimate" shows a significant amount of other LLW is likely to be present in the buildings. This other LLW will include: pipe; glove boxes; tanks; compressors; meters; bubblers; bell jars; fume hoods; concrete floors and footers; vacuum pumps; TERF equipment; bag houses; ID fans on stacks; stacks; duct work; air handling units; steel I beams; roof materials; laboratory benches and cabinets; as well as other possible miscellaneous equipment and building debris. RFP Section H.2 (b), programmatic uncertainty #1 states "The estimated quantity of LLW to be generated ... is 4.3 million cubic feet." The difference between 4.3 million cubic feet and 4.257 million cubic feet is only 43,000 cubic feet.

- (a) Does the DOE estimate that only 43,000 cubic feet of the above mentioned building and process equipment LLW exist on-site for transportation and disposal off-site by the new contractor? If not, what is the estimated volume of LLW for equipment, machinery, piping, building debris, and footers and foundations, etc.?

ANSWER: No. Section H.2.(b).1 clearly states "The estimated quantity of LLW to be generated **from PRS disposition and building footprint contamination** is 4.3 million cubic feet. The difference of 43,000 cubic feet is simply a rounding factor. The estimate for the remaining LLW is not to be provided in the RFP and is dependent on the contractor's technical approach to facility decontamination, demolition and waste minimization.

- (b) Will all LLW, including soils, building debris, and process equipment above the target of 4.3 million cubic feet be compensated as an out-of-scope quantity, i.e., be excluded from the \$340 million Target Cost [RFP Section B.5 (b)]? If not, why is there no programmatic uncertainty or exclusion from the \$340 million Target Cost for the volume of LLW that will be generated from equipment, machinery, piping,

building debris, and footers and foundations, etc., as there appears to be for LLW soil material?

ANSWER: No, Section B.5.(b) is very clear. The DOE intended to bound the greater uncertainty in waste quantities relating to the environmental remediation activities associated with PRS disposition and removal of contaminated soils within building footprints.

- (c) Based upon the current site characterization, what volume of the LLW is expected to require shipment in DOT 7A/Type A packaging? What volume of this LLW requiring DOT 7A/Type A packaging will be considered outside the scope of the \$340 million Target Cost?

ANSWER: The volume of the LLW requiring shipment in DOT 7A/Type A packaging is dependent upon the contractor's technical approach.

123. Reference the SEB website, Administrative References and Links, Capital Equipment by Building - twenty-four (24) pieces of heavy equipment are listed under Building G. Please provide model numbers for the heavy equipment so that potential offerors can assess the appropriateness of available equipment for closure activities.

ANSWER: This information will be provided on the SEB web site by August 27, 2002.

124. Reference to Question #2 of the DOE question response - offerors are told that TRU Waste analysis is conducted on site by mobile vendors. Please supply these vendors name, and a copy of their contract.

ANSWER: All TRU waste in storage has been characterized to meet DOT criteria for shipment to the Savannah River Site. There is no TRU waste analysis being conducted at this time under any contract. (Canberra Corporation previously conducted TRU analysis on site.)

125. Section J, Attachment H, "List of Subcontractors," identifies period of the performance end date for almost all contractors as September 30, 2002. Will these contracts be extended after the new contractor begins performance? If so, what date are they to be extended. Please provide a description of services provided by the subcontractors listed on Attachment H.

ANSWER: It is the responsibility of the successful offeror under the new contract to make the determination as to the extension of the subcontracts. The description of services provided by subcontractors over \$100,000 will be posted to the SEB web site by August 27, 2002.

126. What existing utilities (i.e. ventilation, compressed air, electrical, etc.) will be required to be operational (and remain) for Building T when it is transferred to MMCIC.

ANSWER: See Section C.2.1.2.4.

127. Reference to Question #24 of the DOE question response -offerors are informed that NE mission costs are not included in the RFP. Please identify the new contractor's responsibility in support of the NE mission at the Mound.

ANSWER: See Sections C.2.1.1 and C.2.1.2.

128. Reference to Question #39 of the DOE question response - offerors are informed that there is an automated accounting system used by the current contractor. Will all components and associated software of this system be available to the new MCP contractor? If not, please identify those components and associated software that will and will not be available to the new MCP contractor.

ANSWER: All hardware and software will be left in place.

129. Reference to Question #45 of the DOE question response - offerors are informed that transportation and disposal costs are included in the overall \$340 million Target Cost. Section J, Attachment H does not list either Envirocare or rail transportation suppliers as subcontractors. Please identify all DOE contracts and their amount (or budget) which are included in the overall target costs. Are any costs associated with the DOE oversight included in the target costs? If so, please identify these costs.

ANSWER: The Envirocare of Utah and Nevada Test Site contracts are DOE prime contracts, and the waste disposal fees are provided on the web site. The DOE oversight activities are not included in the Target Cost. However, contractor response to and support of DOE oversight activities are included in the Target Cost.

130. RFP Section B.11 defines the transition period as the period between award of the contract (anticipated to be December 4, 2002) and the beginning of the contract performance period (January 1, 2003). During this critical period of time, the new contractor must evaluate and identify those BWXTO employees it plans to hire, extend offers of hire, and hire these employees. In the event the MCP contract is awarded after December 4, 2002, what is the minimum period that would be allowed for contract transition?

ANSWER: There is no minimum period for contract transition.

131. Clarification of the SEB's answer to Question 93: Can a contract from a non-proposing division/segment, subsidiary, or LLC associated with the offeror (or one of the major team partners of the offeror) be used as a past performance reference? Can such a contract be used as relevant experience in the technical approach.

ANSWER: See Section L.18.IV(1) that states references should be provided for work done only by the proposing division/segment of the offerors firm, not the firm in general.

132. DOE's Industry Interactive Procurement System (IIPS) contains an RFP for Solicitation DE-RP24-03OH20152 that has discrepancies to the RFP provided on the SEB's website. Specially, RFP Section M.4.IV, Past Performance, is different in both RFPs for the same solicitation—the IIPS RFP provides at least one additional Evaluation Factor for Past Performance. Please identify which RFP takes precedence and where other discrepancies between the two "official RFPs" exist.

ANSWER: The discrepancies to the RFP listed on IIPS have been corrected. The IIPS Synopsis and Solicitation Information Description clearly states the sole distribution medium for the solicitation is the Ohio Field Office web site.